



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

will do in one case, that a court of arbitration of more or less scope will fit another case, that a mediatory body will be best in another case. The forum must be such forum as can be had and such as will suit the requirements of the situation in the given case.

Good work in diplomacy springs, not from high aims and not from a desire to bring in the millennium, but from the ability to appreciate what is serious and what is feasible, and what methods may be used to secure results. The best international agent is the man who possesses common sense in an uncommon degree. Speaking from the standpoint of diplomacy or of common sense as you will, I should sum up the situation very briefly. A treaty has been negotiated with England and rejected by the Senate by a minority vote. It has the sympathy and approval of England and of America, of our administration and of theirs. The President could bring it again before the Senate, modified, if need be. The unfinished work could be pressed to completion in this way. Let our effort be with the Executive and the Senate to effect this. And if this be our effort we shall certainly advance our cause in the public mind. Other efforts may be practical, but this is the one which is so in an eminent degree.

#### ADDRESS OF HON. ROBERT TREAT PAINE.

*Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen,*—We have met here upon this mountain top to take counsel how we can promote this cause of international arbitration. We gather strength from meeting strong men deeply interested in the cause, who come from many cities over our broad land. I feel sure that we have gained wisdom from the interchange of counsel that has taken place; we feel less depressed, we feel more sure of the triumph of our cause. Now our special theme this morning is, What can we do to promote the spread of this great interest by educating, arousing, stimulating, guiding, creating public sentiment?

If public opinion is changeable,—“*varium et mutabile semper*,” as the poet irreverently described the former woman (not the new one),—then we may abandon all hope and go home. If public opinion rests upon conscience, if *vox populi* is *vox Dei*, then we may pursue our struggles with confident hope. Now where does our confidence lie? For we cannot influence public opinion, we cannot arouse the public conscience, unless first we are sure we are right. Why are we right? In my judgment, it is because this movement for international arbitration rests upon the fundamental principle of international justice. If arbitration were a tool that could be used Monday and disused Tuesday, if it were a wagon that could be laid aside and some other vehicle employed, we should have no hope. But if it is eternal, essential and fundamental, then we may liken it to that wagon which Emerson proposed to hitch to a star. But I prefer to use the simile which compares arbitration and its progress to a ladder; if it be a ladder we have no reason to be discouraged, though most of us cannot mount to the top, as my friend Dr. Hale would, at one supreme bound. Dr. Hale would give us the Supreme Court of Arbitration instantly, and at the same time, with what seems to me fascinating inconsistency, he proclaims himself an “edge-of-the-wedge-man,”—which I am. I am willing, therefore, to climb out of the Slough of Despond, up this ladder,

one rung at a time, remembering that the top of the ladder is, where Jacob found it, leading into heaven. I am not quite so confident as our host is that a few years will find us at the top; I fear we are engaged in an eternal work, and that this effort to introduce justice among the nations is one that will lead us and our descendants on and employ them during all coming ages. It is an eternal, but a glorious task.

Though we came here somewhat depressed at the failure of the Senate, I for one was relieved and delighted at that summary which Dr. Trueblood gave, showing how this year has marked a greater advance in the progress of international arbitration than any previous year in the world's history. (Applause.) The defeat by the Senate I regard as a blessing in disguise,—not a permanent defeat, but a temporary check, which enables us to appeal with confidence to the pulpit, press and people, to all organizations of trade, commerce or labor, to put on the whole armor of God and gird themselves up so that the next effort shall be a triumphant success.

Some of our friends have thought that the Senate was guilty—I hardly like to repeat the word—of a crime in defeating the treaty. But I think sober second thoughts will lead us to the conclusion that the minority,—and we delight to remember that the treaty was supported by a powerful majority in the Senate, as in the whole country,—the minority were honestly led, by mistaken reasons, to oppose the treaty. From Judge Stiness and from our honored Chairman we have had admirably clear statements about the treaty and the reasons used against it. One of the arguments used against it was that it was an English manoeuvre to entrap America. But we delight to remember—let the American people never forget—that this treaty is a consummation of American policy. We recall with pleasure that the first movement in this direction began with the invitation of the Pan-American Congress in 1888, to which Mr. Blaine gave those magnificent words of welcome, dear to every friend of the cause of international arbitration. Following up a resolve passed, I believe, unanimously by both branches of Congress in April, 1890, a circular letter was issued, over the signature of Mr. Blaine, to all civilized countries, inviting them to make with us treaties of arbitration. This invitation, issued by us in 1890, was accepted by England on a memorable day in 1893, and accepted by France two or three years later; other nations are following. This is American policy; let that great truth be burned into our memories. It is a part of the mission of our country to create peace; let us not be disloyal.

Let us remember the glorious privilege of great responsibility. Let us remember the great responsibility that comes with glorious privilege. Then, if we can gather up these thoughts and ask the pulpit to go on urging them as it has, and the press to take up this idea and spread it broadcast across the land,—if we can convince the conscience of the people, and those other great powers, the labor organizations and the rest, how can we fail?

To say in one last word what I think we ought to do, it is to have the treaty consummated. I cannot follow the brilliant vision of Dr. Hale of a minister to go through the nations and induce them to join us in some new scheme. I believe that the treaty which Mr. Olney worked out, first persuading Lord Salisbury and then presenting it to the English public and to our country,—

that that treaty is a product of human genius which, the more it is studied, the more we shall be delighted to support and to urge. If Mr Sherman and President McKinley desire to engraft improvements upon it, of course we will welcome them. But in its main outlines that treaty seems to me worthy of being made with England, with France, with Italy, with Switzerland, and the rest, one after another, until our cause makes such wide progress that when we meet here, a few years hence, we shall look back on 1897 as ancient history.

#### ADDRESS OF MISS LUCIA T. AMES.

*Mr. President, Gentlemen and Ladies,*—This subject of education as related to arbitration naturally divides itself into three divisions: first, the extent of the particular kind of ignorance which we are here to consider; second, the nature of that ignorance; third, the remedies for that ignorance.

Ten years ago I wrote to the superintendent of schools in Chicago and asked him how many children left school before they had studied United States history. He replied that seventy-five per cent did so before hearing any historical stories, and that ninety per cent left school before they had studied history proper. I made the same inquiry of the state librarian of Wisconsin, and he gave an even more startling reply. I think he said that ninety-five per cent of the children of Wisconsin did not study United States history. The inferences from this are so obvious that I will not take time to state them. While we may admit that there has been some progress in ten years, and that some states show larger proportions studying history, yet it is fair to say that at least four-fifths, if not nine-tenths, of the children in this country leave school without having had any adequate training in the one thing which is certainly prerequisite to intelligent voting,—that is, a knowledge of the elements of United States history.

Three years ago, at the World's Fair in Chicago, I went into the educational department of the Illinois Building, where I saw a large placard with some very interesting statistics. They showed that in the state of Illinois 809,000 children were in the public schools; that of these about 7000 were boys in high schools, and about 14,000 were girls in high schools. This meant that in a typical state only three per cent were getting anything more than the grammar school offers, and that over one hundred per cent more girls than boys were getting a higher education,—that is, were studying whatever of history is taught after United States history, namely, English, Roman and Greek history, besides civics, ethics, literature, and those studies which will best fit them to deal with such matters as we are here to consider. I do not know how accurately that represents the condition to-day, but I think it is safe to say that in most of the states from fifty to one hundred and fifty per cent more girls are getting this higher education than are the boys, who are to be the voters and legislators and are to settle questions of public policy.

Had I suspected that, on this my first visit to Mohonk, I should be called upon to speak, I should have provided myself with statistics which would be accurate up to date.

Since the war a large part (probably nine-tenths) of the education of the people of the United States has been put into the hands of women, ambitious, self-sacrificing women, who are often doing for their pupils the work of the home and the church as well as of the school, but who

often are uncultivated women,—women who are paid on an average less than Colonel Waring pays his street-sweepers! That, I am told, is seven hundred and twenty dollars a year; it is much more than is paid to the average school-teacher in the United States for doing the most delicate, difficult and important work that any citizen is doing.

In the matter of text-books on American history, I cannot take the optimistic view of the president of Roanoke College; I am inclined to think that our text-books and teaching—perhaps more by omissions than by positive statements—inculcate a feeling of bitterness toward England. A report recently circulated by our Commissioner of Education upon this whole matter shows how conscientiously and fairly English text-books have taught the history of the war of the Revolution. I am quite ashamed to say how recently it was that I learned from Mr. John Fiske the truth that the war of the Revolution was not fought between Americans as a unit and English as a unit, but between the progressive party and the retrogressive party on both sides of the Atlantic. American history is not taught in that way, and it ought so to be taught. We forget the great number of Tories that we had in America, and we forget the friends we had in England. Americans abroad are often politely careful not to mention Bunker Hill or the Fourth of July; but I never met an Englishman in my life who did not think of them exactly as we do. Much of the objection to arbitration is due to sheer ignorance of history, and much to gross ignorance of the present animus of the English people.

I am glad that Colonel Waring called our attention last night to the fact that we neglect certain things in human nature which ought to be considered. The writers of text-books and the teachers sometimes forget that the natural child is a natural bigot. The child reasons, "My father, or my country is good to me"; then, "Whatever my father or my country does must be entirely right, and whatever is, or was, opposed to them must be entirely wrong." Liberal-minded parents are sometimes astounded to find what partisanship and bitterness their children reveal when they have neglected to give explicit instruction to counteract the youngsters' false impressions. I remember that at the age of eight I marvelled that the Almighty did not annihilate all Roman Catholics, Jews, Unitarians, and all other obnoxious and dangerous persons who did not hold my father's creed. I was sure that if I had omnipotence I would sweep them off from the face of the earth. (Aside) I should have had no mercy on you, Dr. Hale. I would n't have let you cumber the ground! (Laughter.)

A little girl one day rushed home from Sunday school with the eager inquiry, "Mother, was Jesus a Jew? Teacher says he was a Jew." "Why, yes," said the mother; "certainly he was a Jew." "But how can that be?" queried the perplexed child, "for he was the Son of God, and God is *Presbyterian*!" (Laughter.)

In teaching history no less than in teaching religion the wise teacher must remember that the more sensitive and loyal the child, the more she needs guard against permitting him to harbor prejudices and narrow views.

In regard to the matter of expunging all stories of war from our children's books, as some one desired, it seems to me we need not draw a hard-and-fast rule. I should be very sorry to omit those parts of the Old Testament